10 MARTIN J. SALCEDO,

v.

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

13 SHASTA COUNTY SHERIFF, et al.,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

No. 2:19-cv-2627-EFB P

**ORDER** 

Plaintiff is a county jail inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On April 10, 2020, the court screened plaintiff's complaint and determined that it stated cognizable claims of excessive force and retaliation against defendants Cortez and Rabone. ECF No. 13. Plaintiff has now filed a letter requesting (1) that a "protective order" be added to his case because he fears further retaliation and abuse, and (2) that his public records requests be filed with the court as "proof." ECF No. 19. In a separate filing, plaintiff requests that the court "save" various pictures for his case file. ECF No. 21. The requests are denied.

The court is not a repository for any party's evidence, and the parties shall not file documentary evidence (such as pictures, requests for documents, etc.) in support of his claims unless and until it is necessary to support a motion or is an exhibit that is being offered at trial. At this stage in the proceedings, where the defendants have not even been served, submission of evidence is not necessary.

## Case 2:19-cv-02627-EFB Document 22 Filed 05/19/20 Page 2 of 2

As for the vague request for a "protective order," plaintiff must be more specific with respect to the relief he seeks. To the extent plaintiff requests relief in the form of an injunction, the court notes that a preliminary injunction represents the exercise of a far reaching power not to be indulged except in a case clearly warranting it. Dymo Indus. v. Tapeprinter, Inc., 326 F.2d 141, 143 (9th Cir. 1964). To show that such relief is warranted, plaintiff must prove that he is likely to succeed on the merits of his claims, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of the relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest. Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky, 586 F.3d 1109, 1127 (9th Cir. 2009).

So ordered.

DATED: May 19, 2020.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE